

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action mailed June 29, 2004. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of the Application. Claim 6 has been cancelled, and Claims 1, 16, and 24 have been amended to clarify, more particularly point out, and more distinctly claim inventive concepts previously present in these claims. These amendments are not considered necessary for patentability, and no new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicant has responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

**Section 102 Rejection**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-4 and 6-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,023,726 to Saksena ("*Saksena*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Saksena* fails to disclose, or even teach or suggest, the elements specifically recited in Applicant's claims. For example, *Saksena* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest:

- (1) each link having "a respective associated transaction weight" and "a respective associated user weight";
- (2) "the user weight of an associated link indicating a degree to which to modify the priority of the web page request at the associated link"; or
- (3) "modifying the priority of the web page request at an associated link of the links in accordance with the user weight of the associated link" (recited in independent Claim 1, as amended).

*Saksena* discloses a prefetch value and a threshold value. (*Saksena*, Abstract.) According to *Saksena*, a prefetch value of a link indicates the relevance in retrieving the link before the user asks for it. (*Saksena*, column 4, lines 22-29.) *Saksena* states:

The client 201 uses the prefetch values 308 in the HTML document 306 or pathfile 309 to decide which links on the page are the most likely to be accessed by a typical user. It prefetches the number of documents that it has been configured for from the server 203 according to the threshold value that

the user configured on the client 201. Documents are prefetched that have prefetch values above the user-configured threshold value.

(*Saksena*, column 3, lines 57-64.) That is, the client of *Saksena* compares the prefetch value of a link with a user-configured threshold value to determine whether to prefetch a document.

The Examiner argues:

(1) a transaction weight is taught by the prefetch value of *Saksena* (*Office Action*, page 3, paragraph 2);

(2) a user weight is taught by the user defined threshold value of *Saksena* because the threshold values are minimum weights that trigger a prefetch (*Office Action*, page 3, paragraph 4; page 5, paragraph 4.) Thus, according to the Examiner's interpretation of *Saksena*, a transaction weight of a link is compared with a user weight of the link to determine whether to prefetch a document.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Saksena* fails to disclose, or even teach or suggest, each link having a "respective associated transaction weight" and a separate "respective associated user weight," as recited in independent Claim 1. According to *Saksena*, a prefetch value, or weight, of a link is compared with a threshold value to determine whether to prefetch a document. The threshold value is compared with a weight of a link, but is not itself a weight of a link, not even a minimum weight of a link.<sup>1</sup> Thus, *Saksena* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, each link having "a respective associated transaction weight" and "a respective associated user weight," as recited in independent Claim 1. Claim 1 is allowable over *Saksena* for at least this reason.

Moreover, *Saksena* fails to disclose, or even teach or suggest, "the user weight of an associated link indicating a degree to which to modify the priority of the web page request at the associated link," as recited in independent Claim 1, as amended. As discussed above, the threshold value of *Saksena* is used to determine whether to prefetch a document.

---

<sup>1</sup> A weight is a factor assigned to a number in a computation to make the number's effect on the computation reflect its importance. A threshold is a point separating conditions that will produce a given effect from those of a higher or lower degree that will not produce the effect. (*American Heritage College Dictionary*, third edition, pages 1412, 1530.)

Accordingly, *Saksena* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the user weight of independent Claim 1, as amended.

Furthermore, *Saksena* fails to disclose, or even teach or suggest, “modifying the priority of the web page request at an associated link of the links in accordance with the user weight of the associated link,” as recited in independent Claim 1, as amended. As discussed above, the threshold value of *Saksena* is used to determine whether to prefetch a document. The threshold value of *Saksena*, however, is not used to modify any priority. Accordingly, *Saksena* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the user weight of independent Claim 1, as amended.

Consequently, at a minimum, *Saksena* fails to disclose, or even teach or suggest, the elements specifically recited in Claim 1.

Applicant's dependent claims are allowable based on their dependence on the independent claim and further because they recite numerous additional patentable distinctions over the reference of the rejection. Because Applicant believes he has amply demonstrated the allowability of the independent claim over the reference of the rejection, and to avoid burdening the record, Applicant has not provided detailed remarks concerning these dependent claims. Applicant, however, remains ready to provide such remarks if it becomes appropriate to do so.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 1 and all claims that depend on this claim.

Independent Claims 16 and 24 recite certain limitations substantially similar to those recited in independent Claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, Applicant also respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 16, together with its dependent claims, and independent Claim 24.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicant, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicant believes no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorney for Applicant



Keiko Ichiye  
Reg. No. 45,460

KI/lis

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

Baker Botts L.L.P.  
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, TX 75201-2980  
(214) 953-6494

Date: August 6, 2004